

proposals, Prof L.B. Holthuis noted (BZN 57: 45-46) that it would be advisable to select a lectotype for *C. rathkii*.

I have recently received on loan the *Diastylis rathkii* material from ZMUC. It is a single specimen, an ovigerous female from the Kattegat with the accession no. ZMUC-CRU-7936. The loan paperwork states the specimen to be the 'holotype' and it is apparently the only one now remaining of the original type series.

Băcescu (1992) referred to the two type localities for *D. rathkii* and wrote of the Copenhagen material as 'syntypes', but had not seen or examined the type material (L.B. Holthuis, in litt., September 2001). It is not possible to ascertain at what point during the 160 intervening years the rest of Krøyer's (1841) material was lost.

I confirm that the Copenhagen syntype is a specimen of *Diastylis rathkii* as currently understood. Since it is possible that the original material, from two widely separated localities, may have belonged to more than one taxon, to secure the identity of the nominal species *D. rathkii* I now designate specimen ZMUC-CRU-7936 as the lectotype.

**Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Hydroporus discretus* Fairmaire & Brisout in Fairmaire, 1859 (Insecta, Coleoptera)**

(Case 3147; see BZN 58: 105-107)

Philippe Bouchet

*Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 55 Rue de Buffon, F-75005 Paris, France*

The application seeks to conserve the name *Hydroporus discretus* Fairmaire & Brisout, 1859 by suppressing the name *H. neuter* Fairmaire & Laboulbène, 1854. The senior synonym has been used as valid once after 1899, which excludes the case from the reversal of precedence covered by Article 23.9 of the Code. The application (para. 8) gives four references to works published in the last 50 years that have used the name *discretus* and states that a further 16 references have been given to the Commission Secretariat. My examination of this list of additional references shows that only three have been published in the last 50 years. In my view the applicant has not demonstrated that a name so infrequently used as *Hydroporus discretus* Fairmaire & Brisout, 1859 needs conservation, and priority should apply.

**Comment on the proposed precedence of NYMPHULINAE Duponchel, 1845 over ACENTROPINAE Stephens, 1835 (Insecta, Lepidoptera)**

(Case 3048; see BZN 56: 31-33; 57: 46-48)

David Agassiz

*Department of Entomology, The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.*

I very much support Dr Solis's application for the conservation of the family-group name NYMPHULINAE Duponchel, 1845 by giving it precedence over ACENTROPINAE Stephens, 1835.

I believe Speidel (1981, 1984) was correct in synonymising the subfamilies NYMPHULINAE and ACENTROPINAE, and ACENTROPINAE is the older name. However, my understanding, even before the greater emphasis given to usage in the latest (4th) edition of the Code, is that it is important to preserve a name that is in general use.

Before synonymy with the NYMPHULINAE, the subfamily ACENTROPINAE included only the single genus *Acentria* Stephens, 1829 (the senior synonym of *Acentropus* Curtis, 1834). *Acentria* includes only one species, *A. ephemerella* (Denis & Schiffermüller, 1775) (p. 142), which is European and thought to have been introduced into North America. This distinctive species has hitherto been a problem to systematists: Spuler (1910) and Kloet & Hincks (1972) placed it in the subfamily SCHOENOBIINAE, whilst Meyrick (1928) placed it in the PYRAUSTINAE. In their revisions of the NYMPHULINAE in America, Lange (1956) and Munroe (1972) did not include *Acentria*. Only in recent years has its inclusion in the subfamily NYMPHULINAE been generally accepted.

In the Americas, Asia and Australasia, NYMPHULINAE is the only subfamily name to have been used, and in Europe it is really only Speidel and his colleague Mey who have used ACENTROPINAE (see their comment in BZN 57: 46–48). In the checklists of Australia (Nielsen et al., 1996) and the Neotropical Region (Heppner, 1992), and in works on the family in Japan and Thailand (Yoshiyasu, 1985, 1987), there is no mention of *Acentria* (let alone of the invalid and long disused *Acentropus*). Acceptance of ACENTROPINAE as the valid name would mean a change of subfamily name for all the included species, of which there are about 500 worldwide and several of economic importance, and would be a cause of considerable disruption. I strongly support the application.

#### Additional references

- Denis, J.N.C.M. & Schiffermüller, I. 1775. *Ankündigung eines systematischen Werkes von den Schmetterlingen der Wienergegend*. Vienna.
- Kloet, G.S. & Hincks, W.D. 1972. *A check list of British insects*. viii, 153 pp. London.
- Lange, W.H. 1956. A generic revision of the aquatic moths of North America (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae, Nymphulinae). *Wasmann Journal of Biology*, 14: 59–144.
- Meyrick, E. 1928. *Revised handbook of British Lepidoptera*. vi, 914 pp. London.
- Munroe, E.G. 1972. Pyraloides: Pyralidae (part). *The moths of America north of Mexico*, vol. 13, part 1A. 134 pp. Classey, London.
- Nielsen, E.S., Edwards, E.D. & Rangsi, T.V. (Eds.). 1996. Monographs on Australian Lepidoptera, 4. *Checklist of the Lepidoptera of Australia*. xiv, 529 pp. Collingwood.
- Spuler, A. 1910. *Die Schmetterlinge Europas*, vol. 2. xvii, 523 pp. Stuttgart.
- Yoshiyasu, Y. 1985. A systematic study of the Nymphulinae and the Musotiminae of Japan (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae). *Scientific Reports of the Kyoto Prefectural University (Agriculture)*, 37: 1–162.
- Yoshiyasu, Y. 1987. The Nymphulinae (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae) from Thailand, with descriptions of a new genus and six new species. *Microlepidoptera of Thailand*, 1: 133–184.

**Comment on the proposed conservation of *Cynodon* Spix in Spix & Agassiz, 1829 and *Raphiodon* Agassiz in Spix & Agassiz, 1829, and proposed designation of *C. gibbus* and *R. vulpinus* Spix & Agassiz, 1829 as the respective type species of *Cynodon* and *Raphiodon* (Osteichthyes, Characiformes)**  
(Case 3041: see BZN 57: 151–157)

Maurice Kottelat

*Route de la Baroche 12, Case postale 57, CH-2952 Cornol, Switzerland*

I have read Toledo–Piza & Lazara's application concerning the conservation of the generic names *Cynodon* and *Raphiodon*, and the designation of type species for these genera, and I support their conclusions and proposals.